



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

11/14

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/510.984

10/13/2004

Masaaki Yamauchi

2004\_1444A

2248

513

7590

11/14/2006

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.

2033 K STREET N. W.

SUITE 800

WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

HINES, ANNE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary for Applications Under Accelerated Examination</b>	Application No. 10/510,984	Applicant(s) YAMAUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Anne M. Hines	Art Unit 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
 Since this application has been granted special status under the accelerated examination program,  
**NO extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be permitted and a SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR  
 REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE:**

ONE MONTH OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER,  
 FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION – if this is a non-final action or a *Quayle* action.  
 (Examiner: For **FINAL** actions, please use PTOL-326.)

The objective of the accelerated examination program is to complete the examination of an application within twelve months from the filing date of the application. Any reply must be filed electronically via EFS-Web so that the papers will be expeditiously processed and considered. If the reply is not filed electronically via EFS-Web, the final disposition of the application may occur later than twelve months from the filing of the application.

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2006.  
 2) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 3) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.  
 3a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.  
 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 8) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 9) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 October 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 10) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 11) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/17/06  
 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

The amendment filed on August 31, 2006, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the instant application.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to because Page 11 of the drawings is a list of reference numerals in the drawings and is not a figure. As such, Page 11 of the drawings should be removed. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required

Art Unit: 2879

corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawakami (JP 2002-231141).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Kawakami discloses a method of aging a plasma display panel containing a scan electrode (Drawing 2, 21), sustain electrode (Drawing 2, 22), and a data electrode (Drawing 2, 12), the method having an aging process for performing an aging discharge by application of voltage having an alternating voltage component between the scan and sustain electrodes and applying, after a predetermined time period from a rising time of the voltage component applied between the scan and sustain electrodes, a voltage for suppressing an erase discharge that occurs after the aging discharge to the data electrode (Drawing 2, 30 & 40; Drawing 1, 30 & 40; Abstract; Description of Drawings).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki et al. (US 6924795) in view of Kado et al. (US 6666738) and Hirano et al. (US 2003/0030377).

Regarding claims 1-2 and 4, Kawasaki teaches a plasma display panel containing a scan electrode (Fig. 10, 12; Column 12, lines 11-20), sustain electrode (Fig. 10, 11; Column 12, lines 11-20), and a data electrode (Fig. 10, 21; Column 12, lines 11-20), and waveforms for driving the plasma display panel (Figs. 6(B)-6(D); Figs. 8(A)-8(B); Column 4, lines 52-60). Kawasaki fails to teach the method of manufacturing the plasma display panel. However, Kado teaches that during a plasma display panel manufacturing process a PDP must be aged in order to stabilize the luminescence and discharge characteristics of the display (Column 2, lines 16-20). Further, Hirano teaches that PDPs are aged by driving the PDP under practical conditions of use of the PDP (Page 1, Paragraph [0008]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the driving waveforms Kawasaki teaches for driving the PDP under practical use to age its PDP in order to stabilize the luminescence and discharge characteristics of the display. Therefore, using the driving waveform of Fig. 6 to age the plasma display panel: Kawasaki teaches a driving/aging waveform for a PDP wherein

Art Unit: 2879

application of a voltage between the scan and sustain electrodes has an alternating component and applying, after a predetermined time period from a rising time of the voltage component applied between the scan and sustain electrodes, a voltage for suppressing an erase discharge that occurs after the aging discharge to the data electrode (Figs. 6(B)-6(D); Column 10, lines 19-36; Column 9, lines 12-26). Kawasaki further teaches wherein the erase discharge-suppressing voltage applied to the data electrode is higher during the aging discharge than after the aging discharge (Fig. 15(b1)-(b2)) as required by claim 4.

Regarding claims 3 and 5, Kawasaki further discloses decreasing the discharge suppressing voltage applied to the sustain electrode after the aging discharge takes place (Figs. 8(a)-8(b)).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 31, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1-5, Applicant argues that neither Kawakami or Kawasaki (in conjunction with Kado and Hirano) disclose or teach a method of aging a plasma display panel including applying an erase discharge-suppressing voltage after a predetermined time period from a rising time of a voltage having an alternating voltage component applied at least between the common electrode and scan electrode. Further with regard to Kawakami, Applicant argues that the field discharge and the opposite

Art Unit: 2879

discharge occur at different times during the aging method of Kawakami. Further with regard to Kawasaki, Applicant argues that the alternating voltages applied to the sustain and scan electrodes are 180 degrees out of phase from each other and at no point are both the scan and sustain electrodes high and that the alternating voltage applied to the address electrode rises with the fall of the alternating voltage applied to the scan electrode and falls with the fall of the alternating voltage applied to the sustain electrode.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims of the instant application do not require that the application of the erase discharge-suppressing voltage occurs over the entire aging process, that the high portion of the alternating voltages applied to the scan and sustain electrodes overlap, or that the high portion of the alternating discharge-suppressing voltage applied to the address/data electrode overlap with the high portion of the alternating voltage applied to scan electrode. Specifically, for example, claim 1 only requires that a erase discharge-suppressing voltage be applied 'a predetermined time period' after the rising time of the alternating voltage applied between the scan and sustain voltages. Therefore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., how the high portions of the alternating voltages applied to the scan, sustain, and data/address electrodes overlap) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Hines whose telephone number is (571) 272-2285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anne M Hines  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2879

*Amtt*  
*11/06/06*

*msy*  
**MARICELI SANTIAGO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**